

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: August 27, 2001
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
August 15, 2001 (Meeting #20)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

Public:

Ken Hadley	Self
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Freeman Keller	Land Owner
Matt Lewis	CCHBA
Jim Malinowski	ESA Advisory Committee
Erin Middlewood	The Columbian
Alison Mielke	Friends of Clark County
Bant Phillips	CREDC

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Tamara DeRidder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager
Evan Dust	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Gordon Euler	Clark County Long Range Planning
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager

Rich Lowry
Vicky Ridge-Cooney
Joel Rupley
Bryan Snodgrass
John Tyler
Josh Warner

Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
City of Vancouver
Clark County ESA Program
City of Vancouver Planner
Clark County ESA Program
Clark County Community Development

1. Roll call / Introductions

Commissioner Morris called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM at the Murdock Building. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Review July 18, 2001 meeting Notes.

Commissioner Morris called for comments on the July 18 summary notes. No corrections or changes to the summary notes were made.

3. Endangered Species Act Task Force policy recommendations (Joel Rupley)

Rupley introduced himself and Jim Malinowski, Chair of the ESA Advisory Committee. The ESA Advisory Committee has been developing methods to enhance ESA issues in the Comprehensive Plan. A sub-committee was formed and Malinowski will present what they came up with. The Committee is representative of the community. There are developers, biologists, realtors and other citizens with various forms of expertise on the committee. The chair of the committee rotates.

The Advisory Committee felt that the Comprehensive Plan should reflect ESA concerns. Recommendations have been submitted and are attached to the agenda. They have submitted two sets of recommendations to the Planning Commission. The recommendations are a consensus agreement. They feel an additional chapter should be inserted into the Comprehensive Plan. They feel a document prepared by Fish First could be used as a starting point.

Harris asked if the committee was looking at if the framework plan is being followed. Malinowski responded that they looked at the Comprehensive Plan. Cervený asked if the recommendations would place more limits on cities. Malinowski responded that ordinances in response to the ESA concerns will effect the cities. He feels that we will all benefit from salmon recovery. The case can be made to protect salmon and development equally. Harris echoed this sentiment. There needs to be a balancing act between development and ESA. Malinowski said personally that he feels there should be flexibility in ordinances. He wants things based on science. Look to the things that are really necessary for salmon recovery. Nothing that has been proposed would stop you from developing ordinances that are balanced.

Morris reiterated that the Comprehensive Plan is not a strong hammer, but NMFS and the possibility of a 3rd party law suit are strong hammers. Rupley talked about the overall goal and working with the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board. Different agencies have

different authority and ordinances should be written as such. The county regulated land use. The county needs to look at our own land management activities and the education of citizens and partnerships with other jurisdictions. The regulatory piece is only part of the picture. The regulation needs to be adopted so that it meets standards that NMFS has set forward. We still need to meet the needs of citizens, too. It is a complex balancing act. Rupley feels that the county already has some good ordinances. Malinowski said the Advisory Committee wants the county to go beyond the minimum requirements that NMFS may require. They want something closer to recovery of historic runs of salmon. He feels it is achievable. They want the county to be aggressive and a leader. One way is to put the vision into the Comprehensive Plan.

Morris said the Advisory Committee is balanced between public and private interests. The bottom line is not that Best Available Science (BAS) will determine what development will take place, but 'best available court case'. You can find differing opinions on BAS. The forest and fish agreement worked on this issue and has adopted BAS. Ag, fish and water is being worked on now by a task force that Morris sits on. There are many complexities in the discussion. What you get is the 'best available negotiated science'. We will have to pay attention to the issue, or we will be forced to pay attention. Morris urges people to please look over the recommendations and respond if you have comments.

4. Update of the population and employment allocation process (Pat Lee)

Lee presents. TAC meeting last week to urge other staffs to get numbers in to county staff so that calculations can be made. Several cities will have them in by end of week or end of month. This information is a key issue.

Harris says they are running it by the council. They are looking at what they would like to include in the allocations. Making sure that they have an adequate jobs to housing balance. Also, industrial lands and the inclusion of secondary lands for allocation needs clarification. There is a question around urban reserves and making sure that those lands designated as industrial stay that way. Will the city be able to participate in the urban reserves planning process? Will the lands still be industrial after annexation? Morris responds that it is hard to believe that land would be down-zoned from industrial. Idsinga says BG has the same concerns. Harris says it might be a concern if the residential/jobs allocation is too out of balance. Morris said tentative numbers have already been given to check if the allocations will work. The calculations should be straightforward. Harris wants the jobs to housing ratio to be closer to ½ or 1/1. De Ridder said they are now 1/1.7 and want to go to 1/1.5. Portland aims for 1/1 as a regional center. BG doesn't want all of the people either. They also want their ratio to come down.

Morris said that the commissioners set out parameters in the beginning to support school districts and other infrastructure. Morris admonished cities to get the numbers in to Long Range Planning. Commissioners will arbitrate between the cities if they need to. The numbers are committed to be in by September 1st.

5. Proposed Clark County Interchange Area policy (Evan Dust)

Dust handed out the presentation he is making. Discuss is in the handout. The approach is to try and make development at interchanges more predictable. History is that the improvements never last as long as they should. Capacity is always reached earlier. Predictions are incorrect because the market reacts to new conditions and the changes to land use make the predictions out of date because base assumptions have changed. Clark County is proposing a new Comprehensive Plan policy. Land use changes would be more restricted and would have to be studied and meet specific criteria and/or do mitigation. Family wage employment would be a key mitigation tool. A new code would be implemented. A draft of the code was circulated and some comments have been received.

6. Technical Advisory Committee Update

Lee reported that the EIS process is moving. Interviews will be next week. The county and cities may try to get CTED grants. Kufeldt-Antle requested more info to the cites on the grant applications. Lee responded that they are from CTED and some money is set aside for each city and county, at different levels. Most interest in collaboration was in the EIS funding. Kufeldt-Antle stated that the confusion might be within their city and what will the county be looking at, what is the scope of work? Lee responds that the county is entitled to \$75,000. Different cities have different levels available. This is an attempt at pooling the funds.

Higbie said that the September presentation by the Health District will not be happening.

7. Next meeting date and time

Next meeting is September 19, 2001. May be a status report on sewer/septic issues, but nothing substantive until October/November.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - august 15 2001(#20).doc